

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/527,137		03/16/2000	Michael E. Pietraszak	14531.57.2 1992		
22913	7590	02/25/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
WORKMAN NYDEGGER (F/K/A WORKMAN NYDEGGER &				KOENIG, ANDREW Y		
SEELEY) 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2611	•		
			DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7

			=
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	/
Office Action Summany	09/527,137	PIETRASZAK ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Y Koenig	2611	_
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	- action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E			
Disposition of Claims	in parto quayro, roco c.b. 11, 10	0.0.210.	
·			
4) Claim(s) <u>1-78</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	in from consideration.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-78</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		xaminer	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	-,,	` '	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	-	• /	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-	(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	. ,		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received in Application	n No	
Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ty documents have been received	d in this National Stage	
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not received	I.	
Attachmont(a)			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Dat	e	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5.6</u> .	5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	tent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,157,411 to Williams et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,557,724 to Sampat et al.

Regarding claims 1 and 42, Williams teaches gathering data from plural inputs (such as from a DSS receiver, vertical blanking interval (VBI), and other remote sources (col. 5, II. 22-51) and storing the data in database. Further, Williams teaches a data parser 204, which collects the data from the various sources and the data engine 206 for storing the data in the database (col. 5-6, II. 62-9). Williams is silent on explicitly using the data for an electronic program guide (EPG). Official Notice is taken that gathering data from plural sources and displaying in an EPG is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by gathering data from plural sources and displaying in an EPG in order to provide a convenient user interface to the user thereby providing access to various channels independent of source. Williams is silent on calling and executing functions. Sampat teaches loading functions from modules and enabling execution of the functions (col. 33, II. 6-23). Therefore, it would have been

Art Unit: 2611

obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by loading and executing functions as taught by Sampat in order to provide a uniform interface for a program to access resources thereby promoting a more robust and platform independent system.

Regarding claims 43 and 78, Williams teaches gathering data from plural inputs (such as from a DSS receiver, vertical blanking interval (VBI), and other remote sources (col. 5, II. 22-51) and storing the data in database. Further, Williams teaches a query interface 208, which collects the data from the various sources and the data engine 206 for storing the data in the database (col. 6, II. 6-27). Williams is silent on explicitly using the data for an electronic program guide (EPG). Official Notice is taken that gathering data from plural sources and displaying in an EPG is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by gathering data from plural sources and displaying in an EPG in order to provide a convenient user interface to the user thereby providing access to various channels independent of source. Williams is silent on calling and executing functions. Sampat teaches loading functions from modules and enabling execution of the functions (col. 33, II. 6-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by loading and executing functions as taught by Sampat in order to provide a uniform interface for a program to access resources thereby promoting a more robust and platform independent system.

Art Unit: 2611

Regarding claims 2-7, 12-41, 44-50, 54-64, and 67-74, Williams is silent on explicit function names and parameters. Official Notice is taken that functions and at least one parameter are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by using functions with at least one parameter in order to enable access to uniform access to resources thereby creating a more robust system.

Regarding claims 8-11, 51-53, 65-66, and 75-77, Williams is silent on explicit function names. Official Notice is taken that functions are well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Williams by using functions in order to enable access to uniform access to resources thereby creating a more robust system.

Conclusion

- 3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- U.S. Patent 5,550,576 to Klosterman teaches an EPG system that gathers data from plural sources.
- U.S. Patent 5,990,883 to Byrne et al. teaches integrating information from different tuning spaces and storing the data in a local database (col. 5-6, II. 59-49).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Y Koenig whose telephone number is (703) 306-0399. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (7:30 - 6:30).

Art Unit: 2611

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ayk

HAITRAN

BATENT EXAMINER